



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2024

**by S Dean MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 12 November 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/24/3351462**

**1 Springfield Road, Guiseley, Leeds, LS20 8AL**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr S Barghout against the decision of Leeds City Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/02729/FU.
  - The appeal development is a door and shopfront to ground floor shop.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a door and shopfront to ground floor shop at 1 Springfield Road, Guiseley, Leeds, LS20 8AL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02729/FU, and the plans submitted with it.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The development subject to this appeal has already taken place. It is consistent with the submitted plans and I was able to see it on my site visit. I have removed the narrative elements of the description.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal development on the character and appearance of the site and the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is currently in use as a salon with a flat above. Previously the flat was accessed via an internal staircase inside the salon, sharing an external door but with its own door at the top of that staircase. A separate external door for the flat has been provided, with the shop window reduced and a new external door for the salon installed. The proportions of the openings, their vertical relationship to the windows above and the lintel height have remained as before.
5. The site is a mid-terrace property on a side street within the Guiseley Conservation Area (the CA). The Guiseley Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (the CAA) identifies that the significance of the CA lies in its past development from a rural medieval village to a booming industrial mill town. The quality of the public realm is identified as an issue, as is the need to retain historic shopfronts. The site lies within the Civic and Commercial Town Character Area, which developed as the focal point of the 19<sup>th</sup> century industrial town. The site and properties around it are identified as positive buildings within the CA.

6. As a result, I find whilst the site does contribute to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset, given its side street location, the variety (in form, proportion and appearance) within the shopfronts throughout the CA and in Springfield Road itself, its contribution is somewhat limited.
7. Although the appeal development has altered the site, with the reduction in the size of the window, the slightly awkward and perhaps unfortunate finish to the windowsill, the overall effect of it upon the site and indeed the wider area, noting the positive buildings which surround it, is, in my opinion, limited.
8. The area has plainly undergone change, with the introduction of a wide variety of shop front styles and materials, which, through incremental change over time have led, to my mind, to shopfronts in the CA having an extremely varied character and appearance. Indeed, the units immediately around the site have themselves a wide variety of materials, finishes and appearances, with different window sizes, depths, heights, relationship to doors and the ground level.
9. Given that, I do not consider that the appeal development has fundamentally altered the quality or contribution of the building to the overall significance or quality of the CA. I also do not consider that the appeal development alters or otherwise harms the overall significance of the CA itself.
10. Overall, I therefore find that the appeal development has not caused harm to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset, and I find that the appeal development preserves the character of the area.
11. Turning to the effect of the appeal development on the character and appearance of the site itself, whilst elements of the detailing are perhaps unfortunate, the proportions and alignment of the building remain, the story and history of its change and development is still evident and legible, particularly as the vertical relationship of the openings between the ground floor and the upper floors has remained. The rising ground level to the front of the site, which means that the original windowsill level is roughly level with the original doorstep further reduces the visibility and effect of the appeal development.
12. The materials are different. Different to what was there before, to some of the other materials in the area, and to what the Council would prefer, however I do not consider that they are so different, or so obvious as to be jarring when viewing the site in its context. I also note that shop front materials are not permanent; shopfronts, their design, appearance and finished materials change over time, as they have done here.
13. I acknowledge the case made by the Council, that some of the shopfronts nearby are unauthorised, some are unfortunate, and some would not be permitted today. However, they are nevertheless in place, and even in spite of some of the criticisms of them by the Council, the area, the CA in particular, and the individual buildings still retain their overall sense of quality and continue to make positive contributions to the character and appearance of the area and the CA.
14. Taking all of the above together, having given great weight to the conservation of the CA as a heritage asset, noting that I find the appeal development preserves the character of the CA, I find that the appeal development does not harm the character and appearance of the site and the area.

15. As such, it does not conflict with Policies P10 and P11 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy (as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019), Policy RTC4 of the Leeds Local Plan Development Plan Document Site Allocations Plan as amended 2024, or Policies GP5, BD6, BC7 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006. These policies taken together see, amongst other things, to ensure that design is appropriate for context, location, scale and function, that the historic environment is conserved, and that shopping fronts and frontages are protected for their own sake and from inappropriate change. I am also satisfied that the appeal development is consistent with the CAA. In addition, the appeal development does not conflict with national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Conditions**

16. As the appeal development has already been carried out, further conditions are unnecessary.

### **Conclusion**

17. Therefore, I find that the appeal development does not conflict with the development plan, there are no material considerations to indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with it, so the appeal should be allowed.

*S Dean*

INSPECTOR